

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISON**

JENNILYN SALINAS, LINDSEY
NGUYEN, DEANNA LORRAINE,
“P.P.”, “D.D.”, “T.M.”, “S.M.” AND
“M.L.” FOR THEMSELVES AND AS
PUTATIVE CLASS
REPRESENTATIVES,

Plaintiffs.

v.

NANCY PELOSI, MITCH
McCONNELL, CHUCK SCHUMER,
MARK ZUCKERBERG, JOSEPH
BIDEN, KAMALA HARRIS, BRAD
RAFFENSPERGER, ALL
MEMBERS OF THE 117TH U.S.
CONGRESS, ALL 50 STATE
GOVERNORS AND SECRETARIES
OF STATE,¹ JACK DORSEY, MIKE
PODHORZER, PETE SESSIONS,
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
DEMOCRATIC SENATE
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
COMMITTEE,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:21-CV-162

JURY TRIAL REQUESTED

**PLAINTIFFS’ FIRST AMENDED CLASS ACTION² COMPLAINT
AND APPLICATION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

COME NOW, Jennilyn Salinas,³ Lindsey Nguyen, Deanna Lorraine, “P.P.,”
“D.D.”, “T.M.”, “S.M.” and “M.L.” (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), by and through their

¹ Members of Congress and the state officials will be named and served individually.

² A motion for class certification is forthcoming following service of process on Defendants.

³ Former Plaintiff Jeremy Bravo has decided he no longer wishes to pursue his claims in this lawsuit. Jennilyn Salinas replaces Jeremy Bravo as the first named Plaintiff and Plaintiffs request that the clerk re-titled this action in

attorney, Paul M. Davis, for themselves and seeking certification as representatives of a class of injured parties, which is all 328 million Americans who were deprived of an elected form of government, respectfully represent the following to this Honorable Court:

**I.
INTRODUCTION:**

This, the People’s Lawsuit seeks to end the era of rule by wealthy elites and their corrupt two-party political establishment and to restore the form of representative government guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

1. Plaintiffs’ lawsuit (the “People’s Lawsuit” or “Lawsuit”) is unlike any other lawsuit that has been before the American courts related to the 2020 elections because it does not seek a *political* outcome, but a *constitutional* outcome. It does not seek to change the declared winner of any election in 2020 from “Democrat” to “Republican” or vice versa. Rather, this lawsuit demonstrates why members of the 117th Congress, Joe Biden, and Kamala Harris do not lawfully hold federal office because of severe and pervasive violations of federal election law and the U.S. Constitution in the 2020 elections carried out by an elite group of wealthy individuals and corrupt or complicit politicians. Their purpose was to effectively replace the republican form of representative government, guaranteed by the Constitution, with an oligarchy. As remedies, Plaintiffs seek a new, constitutional federal election and monetary damages.

2. Congress, Biden, and Harris are the illegitimate fruit of an unconstitutional 2020 federal election process because state election officials and

the Court’s electronic docket as *Salinas v. Pelosi* and that Jeremy Bravo be removed from being a party to this case in the electronic docket.

executives, using the COVID-19 pandemic as an excuse, made changes in election procedures in violation of federal election law and thereby violated Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. Together, Congress and Mark Zuckerberg distributed \$700 million in federal and private funds, respectively, to state election officials who used the funds to conduct the 2020 election in violation of federal election law. The state officials were required to follow federal election law under Article I, § 4 of the Constitution and pursuant to the conditional receipt of federal funds from Congress but failed or refused to do so. Whether the violations were many or few, the voting and tabulation procedures in all 50 states failed to follow federal election law, thus rendering the entire 2020 federal election unconstitutional.

3. These federal election laws, specifically, the Help America Vote Act of 2002 and the record-keeping requirements of the 1960 Civil Rights Act, were put in place long ago for the very purpose of protecting all Americans from ballot box stuffing and other fraudulent election schemes designed to deprive Americans of their “most precious” right: “the right to choose their own officers for governmental administration.”⁴ When election procedure itself violates the very laws put in place to prevent and detect the theft (or perhaps more accurately in this case, the *purchase*) of federal elections, there can be no more clear deprivation of constitutional rights.

4. Congress took the hard-earned tax dollars of working class Americans, like Plaintiffs, and used it to deprive them of their own right to have a say in who governs them. Zuckerberg used obscene profits from the cattle-like commoditization

⁴ *Duncan v. McCall*, 139 U.S. 449, 461 (1891); *United States v. State of Tex.*, 252 F. Supp. 234, 250–51 (W.D. Tex.), *aff'd sub nom. Texas v. United States*, 384 U.S. 155 (1966).

of human beings on social media to install politicians willing to look the other way so that he and his cohorts in the technology industry can continue to influence elections by controlling the flow of public information and speech.

5. The People's Lawsuit is unlike any other lawsuit in history because it is the first time that a class of all Americans, who are not members of the wealthiest 1%, the political elite, or the corporations that all run the corrupt two-party system, has sued to win back their constitutional rights to a representative form of government. Plaintiffs sue to reestablish the nation that was originally envisioned and framed by their forefathers, the revolutionaries who laid down their lives and everything they held dear, to establish the first nation in world history that was a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

6. The People's Lawsuit is about how both state and federal officials acted together as "Democrats" and "Republicans" and as part of a "well-funded cabal"⁵ and "conspiracy"⁶ with various private persons, including persons in the news media, social media, and technology industry, high net worth individuals, and others, to willfully deprive the American People of their "most precious" and fundamental right: the right to the "Republican Form of Government" guaranteed by Article IV, Section 4 (the "Guarantee Clause") of the Constitution of the United States and other fundamental civil rights.

⁵ Molly Ball, *The Secret History of the Shadow Campaign That Saved the 2020 Election*, TIME (Feb. 4, 2021), p. 6, attached hereto at **Exhibit 1** and available at <https://time.com/5936036/secret-2020-election-campaign>.

⁶ *Id.*

7. Plaintiffs declare the era of the elite class is now at an end. No longer will these wealthy elites rule “We The People of the United States.”⁷ Our Founding Fathers *already* paid for the rights at issue in this Lawsuit *with their own blood*. No court can lawfully deny such fundamental rights and the enforcement thereof.

A. The Supreme Court explains the guarantee to the people of “Republican Form of Government” in the Constitution.

8. In an 1891 opinion affirming this most honorable and storied Western District of Texas, the Supreme Court concluded: “By the constitution, a republican form of government is guarantied⁸ to every state in the Union, and *the distinguishing feature of that form is the right of the people to choose their own officers for governmental administration*, and pass their own laws in virtue of the legislative power reposed in representative bodies, *whose legitimate acts may be said to be those of the people themselves*; but while the people are thus the source of political power, their governments, national and state, have been limited by written constitutions, and they have themselves thereby set bounds to their own power, *as against the sudden impulses of mere majorities*.” *Duncan v. McCall*, 139 U.S. 449, 461 (1891) (emphasis added).

9. It is truly ironic that the *Duncan* case originated in the Western District of Texas. The Supreme Court’s most robust explanation, in *Duncan*, of the Constitution’s Guarantee Clause, which reads, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government,”⁹ captures the very

⁷ U.S. Constitution, Preamble.

⁸ An alternate, more archaic spelling of the word.

⁹ U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 4.

essence of Plaintiffs’ action before this Court. At its core, Plaintiffs’ cause of action is very simple: the acts of Defendants described herein have both the result *and* the aim of depriving Plaintiffs of their most fundamental right, the right to a republican form of government, which is government “deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,”¹⁰ a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.”¹¹ Plaintiffs’ come before this Court because, as demonstrated herein, Defendants have stripped them of this most sacred of human rights and other fundamental rights.

10. Considering that one of the most renown opinions to come out of the Western District of Texas was a minority voting rights case striking down the Texas poll tax, it is almost as if the Western District of Texas were destined to enter the relief requested in this lawsuit. In *United States v. Texas*, the Court opined, “the right to vote” is “our most precious right . . . the essence of a democratic society.” *United States v. State of Tex.*, 252 F. Supp. 234, 250–51 (W.D. Tex.), *aff’d sub nom. Texas v. United States*, 384 U.S. 155 (1966). By this complaint, Plaintiffs request that the Court preserve our “Republican Form of Government” and the “democratic society” on which it stands.

B. “Sudden impulses of mere majorities.”

11. The terms “democracy” and republic,” are often used interchangeably. In fact, they are not interchangeable. Black’s Law Dictionary gives the following definition for *republic*:

A system of government in which the people hold sovereign power and elect representatives who exercise that power. • It contrasts

¹⁰ The Declaration of Independence para. 2 (U.S. 1776).

¹¹ Abraham Lincoln, The Gettysburg Address para. 3 (Nov. 19, 1863).

on the one hand with a pure democracy, in which the people or community as an organized whole wield the sovereign power of government, and on the other with the rule of one person (such as a king or dictator) or of an elite group (such as an oligarchy, aristocracy, or junta).

REPUBLIC, Black's Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019). The “pure democracy,” described in this definition, inevitably results in the tyranny of “mere majorities” described by the Supreme Court in *Duncan*. See 139 U.S. at 461 (“limited by written constitutions . . . as against the sudden impulses of mere majorities”). Under a “democracy,” even a razor thin 51% ideological majority can quickly descend into oppressive government persecution of the 49% minority. As we have seen throughout history, it is human nature to control and subjugate the “minority.” This is why the framers of the Constitution created a “republic” with checks and balances to avoid a situation in which a mere 51% majority runs roughshod over the rights of the minority based on their “sudden impulses.”

12. Democrats currently hold a literal 51% majority¹² in the House of Representatives, a “50 plus one”¹³ advantage in the Senate, and, having “won” a presidential Electoral College vote in which the “popular vote,” as officially reported, came to 51.3% for Joe Biden,¹⁴ hold the Executive Branch with razor-thin popular support. Despite appearing to take both Congress and the Presidency with a mere 51% “majority,” the Democrats have already enacted dramatic and sweeping policy

¹² 222 out of 435 total seats is exactly 51%.

¹³ With Kamala Harris, as “President of the Senate,” acting as the tie-breaking vote.

¹⁴ 2020 National Popular Vote Tracker, THE COOK POLITICAL REPORT, available at <https://cookpolitical.com/2020-national-popular-vote-tracker>.

changes through “Executive Orders”¹⁵ and stand ready to pass essentially *permanent* changes to the laws of the United States through legislation,¹⁶ which they may even force through via the “nuclear options” of eliminating Senate “guardrails” such as the “filibuster” and the “Byrd Rule.”¹⁷

13. Certainly, such a situation is itself cause for alarm as it gives the distinct appearance that our Nation has reached the exact situation warned of in *Duncan* where a “mere majority” is poised to cram down their “sudden impulses” on the 49% “minority.” However, the current situation is actually infinitely worse than it appears.

C. Molly Ball of TIME lays out how Defendants deprived Plaintiffs of their right to a “Republican Form of Government.”

14. A conspiracy to deprive Americans of the republican form of government, a form of government that has existed (albeit to an ever-diminishing extent) since the Constitution of the United States went into effect in March of 1789, would obviously need to be well-funded, with many moving parts and actors in powerful places, and would need to be *secret*, since an overwhelming majority of Americans, presumably, still strongly believe in government “of the people, by the people, and for the people.” Describing such a conspiracy to the Court is a monumentally difficult task in a time where any attempt to contravene the prevailing

¹⁵ See Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 10-1 “Alternate Proposed TRO”), pp. 4–5.

¹⁶ See Memorandum to Support Entry of Alternative Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 10), ¶¶ 3–9 and footnotes.

¹⁷ See Dave Hoppe, *Democrats Flirt with Destroying Another Senate Guardrail*, NATIONAL REVIEW (Feb. 15, 2021) available at <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/politics/democrats-flirt-with-destroying-another-senate-guardrail/ar-BB1dH5T7> (The “Byrd Rule,” similar to the filibuster, “limits the ability of the majority to stuff extraneous legislative goodies into budget-related proposals and pass them with a simple-majority vote under that process.”).

narrative in popular news media and on social media is immediately dismissed as a “conspiracy theory” and its progenitors labeled as “crackpots,” which is, indeed, part of the strategy to “control the flow of information.”

15. Fortunately, in what is nothing short of a godsend to Plaintiffs, Molly Ball of TIME and other TIME reporters credited in Secret History,¹⁸ essentially did most of Plaintiffs’ work for them. In an article dated February 4, 2021, Ms. Ball conveniently, and in detailed fashion, laid out *The Secret History of the Shadow Campaign That Saved the 2020 Election* (the “Secret History”). See **Exhibit 1**. In her Secret History, Ball describes the “conspiracy to save the 2020 election” as something its participants *want told*:

That’s why the participants want the secret history of the 2020 election told, even though it sounds like a paranoid fever dream—a *well-funded cabal of powerful people*, ranging across industries and ideologies, working together behind the scenes to influence perceptions, *change rules and laws*, steer media coverage and *control the flow of information*. They were not rigging the election; they were fortifying it. And they believe the public needs to understand the system’s fragility in order to ensure that democracy in America endures.

Id., p. 6 (emphasis added). Of course, Ball inserts the last sentence as a thinly-veiled attempt to whitewash Defendants’ conspiracy as an effort “to ensure that democracy in America endures.” However, the apparent goal of the “conspiracy,” as described in the article’s opening paragraphs, was “Trump’s ouster.” *Id.* at p. 1.

16. Plaintiffs could likely state their entire claims upon which relief could be granted by merely cutting and pasting only the Secret History in its entirety into

¹⁸ Secret History, p. 26 (“With reporting by Leslie Dickstein, Mariah Espada, and Simmone Shah”)

the factual allegations section and omitting the “whitewashing” statements about “protecting democracy.” Indeed, this entire section of this Original Complaint is intended, not only as an introduction, but also as factual allegations and Plaintiffs’ hereby incorporate all factual allegations in this entire introductory section, by reference, into the Statement of Facts below, as though fully set forth therein. Despite media coverage to the contrary,¹⁹ as stated at the outset in the Original Complaint (Doc. 1), this Lawsuit is not about changing the “declared winner” of the “2020 Presential Election.”

D. Secret History reveals how the 2020 Federal Election had little to do with the “will of the people.”

17. Rather, this Lawsuit is about remedying Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights to “choose their own officers for governmental administration”²⁰—to elect their representatives to government. Secret History gives a *shocking* detailed account about how the 2020 Federal Election had almost nothing to do with the “will of the people.”²¹ Instead, it had everything to do with a political power play by a “well-funded cabal of powerful people” (the “Cabal”).²²

18. Indeed, it is difficult to decide on the most appallingly horrific paragraph from Secret History that sums up Defendants’ nefarious conspiracy, but the following paragraph is about as good as any. In depicting a truly disturbing “battle”²³ between

¹⁹ See Memorandum to Support Entry of Alternative Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 10), ¶ 1.

²⁰ *Duncan*, 139 U.S. at 461.

²¹ Secret History at p. 26.

²² The term Cabal is intended at all times to be used to include Defendants named herein as well, all of whom were participants in the conspiracy described in Secret History.

²³ *Id.* at 20 (“ But the battle wasn’t over.”).

the Cabal and Trump, where the two camps try to outmaneuver each other to influence certification of the Michigan vote, Secret History states the following:

The pro-democracy forces were up against a Trumpified Michigan GOP controlled by allies of Ronna McDaniel, the Republican National Committee chair, and Betsy DeVos, the former Education Secretary and a member of a billionaire family of GOP donors. On a call with his team on Nov. 18, Bassin²⁴ vented that his side's pressure was no match for what Trump could offer. "Of course he's going to try to offer them something," Bassin recalls thinking. "Head of the Space Force! Ambassador to wherever! We can't compete with that by offering carrots. *We need a stick.*"

Secret History, p. 23. This paragraph is a microcosm of how corrupt the American political system has become. Not even a popular, "populist" candidate like President Trump could win an election in such a system without having to try and beat the Cabal at its own game on occasion.

19. The most nauseating aspect of Secret History is that Ms. Ball is actually bragging about the efforts of these shadowy members of the Cabal, acting behind the scenes to manipulate the election outcome, as *heroic*. Ball, an obvious sycophant, if not an outright member, of the Cabal, casts the Cabal, which she further described as an "informal alliance between left-wing activists and business titans,"²⁵ as the protagonists of TIME's epic poem because, of course, they opposed the wicked villain, Donald Trump.

20. What is conspicuously missing from her account, however, is any apparent concern for the actual will of American voters. Ball gives lip service to it, of course. It would defeat the purpose of the Cabal to fully give away their con of the

²⁴ Ian Bassin, Co-founder of "Protect Democracy," a group included in Secret History as part of the "Cabal."

²⁵ Secret History, p. 2.

American People. But the lack of concern (or possibly outright disdain) for the will of American voters is belied throughout the article. The “concern for democracy” is actually expressed as grave concern that voters would, in fact, do the *unthinkable* and cast a vote for Donald J. Trump.

E. Secret History reveals, ironically, the “concern for democracy” was, in fact, a concern regarding for whom Americans would vote.

21. Mike Podhorzer, whom Ball describes as “The Architect,” allegedly orchestrated the entire conspiracy out of a concern that support for Donald Trump had cut into the Democrat’s traditional grip on the voting bloc of “blue collar white voters” who comprise much of the membership in the well-known Democrat stronghold, the AFL-CIO labor union. *Id.* at p. 7. So, “[h]e began circulating weekly number-crunching memos to a small circle of allies and hosting strategy sessions in D.C.” According to Ball, everything apparently grew from there. In other words, ***the entire original purpose*** of the Cabal was to make sure that traditional Democrat voters did not defect from the ranks to vote for a populist²⁶ candidate, Donald Trump.

22. Secret History is written in language to give the appearance that the Cabal acted out of some grave concern for “democracy,” when in fact it reveals the exact opposite. The Cabal carried out their conspiracy out of fear that *people would actually vote for Donald Trump*. This much is abundantly clear in several additional statements made throughout Secret History. On page 15, Ball reports that Podhorzer, in organizing the Cabal, “was warning everyone he knew that polls were

²⁶ See, e.g., Noah Bierman, *Even if Trump loses, Trumpism may outlast him*, THE LOS ANGELES TIMES (Oct. 23, 2020) available at <https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2020-10-23/even-if-trump-loses-trumpism-may-outlast-him>

underestimating Trump’s support.” On page 19, it describes the Democrat “despair” on election night that “Trump was running ahead of pre-election polling, winning Florida, Ohio, and Texas easily and keeping Michigan, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania too close to call.” However, Podhorzer, “was unperturbed” because the “surge” in Trump’s support was exactly what he had planned for. *Id.* at p. 19. Apparently, the Cabal had already made sure the *fix was in* to thwart the will of anyone who voted in a way that “business titans” (specifically including those in the “U.S. Chamber of Commerce”), the “AFL-CIO,” “left-wing activists,” their allies in the news media, social media, and technology industries, and federal, state, and local level officials (all included in Secret History as members of the “Cabal”) did not like.

F. Similar tactics used to sink Bernie Sanders, the Democrat populist candidate.

23. What is incredibly ironic, is that while TIME describes the Cabal as composed overwhelmingly of left-wing progressives, supporters of populist Democrat candidate, Bernie Sanders, may note similarities between Ball’s description of the “shadow campaign” against Trump to the demise of the Sanders campaign. Sanders held frontrunner status in the 2020 Democrat presidential primary until the eve of “Super Tuesday.” As The Guardian reports: “Sanders’ ascent set off *panic* among [Democrat] party officials and leaders. Swing-district Democrats warned Sanders would hurt their chances of re-election, while *members²⁷ of the Democrat National Committee plotted to stop him* if he arrived at the convention shy of the delegates

²⁷ According the corporate documents and by-laws, only leaders of this partisan enterprise can be “members of the Democrat National Committee.”

need to win the nomination outright.²⁸ According to The New York Times, “Interviews with dozens of Democratic Party officials, including 93 superdelegates, found overwhelming opposition to *handing* Mr. Sanders the nomination if he fell short of a majority of delegates.”²⁹ Party leaders were “willing to risk intraparty damage to stop his nomination at the national convention in July if they get the chance.”³⁰ In other words, just as in regard to Trump, the political establishment would do whatever it had to in order to thwart the will of the people in electing an establishment outsider.

24. There is no question Sanders was the anti-establishment populist candidate from the left. If his frontrunner status had continued, it would have set up a worst-nightmare scenario for the political establishment and “corporate elite” where, for the first time in modern American history, if ever, the presidential election would be a choice between TWO anti-establishment populist candidates. Jennifer Epps-Addison, the president of the Center for Popular Democracy, which endorsed Sanders, stated: “We’re taking on not only the corporate elite of this party but the billionaire class, the pharmaceutical industry, the prison industrial complex, Wall Street, the insurance companies.”³¹

²⁸ Lauren Gambino, *How Bernie Sanders went from frontrunner to the last-chance saloon*, THE GUARDIAN (Mar. 15, 2020) available at <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/mar/15/bernie-sanders-vermont-senator-socialist-democratic-party>.

²⁹ Lisa Lerer and Reid J. Epstein, *Democratic Leaders Willing to Risk Party Damage to Stop Bernie Sanders*, The New York Times (Mar. 2, 2020) available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/27/us/politics/democratic-superdelegates.html>.

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.*

25. The Washington Post, self-proclaimed sentinels against the death of “Democracy”³² “in Darkness,” described “striking” similarities between Trump supporters and Bernie supporters in an article entitled, *Trump and Sanders lead competing populist movements, reshaping American politics*: “Each is powered by a disdain for elites they perceive as having flourished while other Americans suffered, a rejection of the establishment and the figures who have controlled it, and a contempt for the institutions that over the decades have blunted, as they see it, the success of efforts like theirs.” Even a broken clock is right twice per day, and The Washington Post hit the nail on the head with this statement.

26. It is this class of “populists” for which Plaintiffs now sue, those who are sick and tired of being treated like cattle by this elite establishment. Plaintiffs are tired of having to choose between the “lesser of two evils” establishment candidates every four years. President Trump and Senator Sanders were anti-establishment candidates who won the hearts of common, everyday Americans, who then saw their candidates eventually destroyed by the Cabal.

27. The Trump camp differs from the Bernie camp only in the *means* of resolving the same problem and the best man for the job. There should be no disagreement between the two camps that Defendants *are* the problem and have caused severe injuries to the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs. It is time for the

³² Strangely, none of these publications ever seem to reference a “republic” as defined further above. It is always “democracy,” which would seem to drive the very narrative that the tyranny of a 51% majority is exactly what the Constitution prescribes, when it clearly is not. Plaintiffs contend this is yet another willful tactic of Defendants.

corrupt two-party system to end and for the People to rule themselves once again, as intended by the founding fathers.

G. Secret History essentially states Plaintiffs' causes of action for them.

28. As stated at the outset in the Original Complaint, this Lawsuit does not address “election fraud.” Likely, evidence of election fraud will be brought forth in the course of the Lawsuit to show intent of the Defendants or bolster other elements, but such evidence is not necessary for Plaintiffs to prevail on their claims. Rather this lawsuit is about how, to carry out their conspiracy to deprive Plaintiffs of their constitutional rights, Defendants altered the rules and procedures of the 2020 Federal Elections in all 50 states, and including Guam, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia (collectively, with the 50 States, the “Voting Districts”) in a manner that severely and pervasively violated the election integrity safeguards enacted by Congress in the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as amended, 52 U.S.C. §§ 20901–21145 (“HAVA”) and Section 301–302 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960, 52 U.S.C. §§ 20701–02 (the “1960 CRA”) (collectively, HAVA and the 1960 CRA, the “Election Integrity Safeguards”).

29. Secret History discusses this conspiracy to violate these Election Integrity Safeguards, starting on page 10 under the subheading “Securing the Vote.” One particularly disturbing, yet telling paragraph in the article comes earlier where, after Ball discusses Podhorzer’s attempts to expand his Cabal by finding “liberals who saw Trump as a dangerous dictator,” she credits Podhorzer with concluding: “America’s decentralized election system couldn’t be rigged in one fell swoop. That

presented an opportunity to shore it up.” The attempt to “shore it up,” however, was actually the scheme to violate the Election Integrity Safeguards, primarily through the expansion of mail-in or absentee voting (collectively, “Mail-In Voting”). Secret History, pp. 10–12.

30. Of course, the Cabal, composed in large part, of the Defendants in this lawsuit, needed funding to violate the Election Integrity Safeguards, \$400 million of which, they received from Congress in the CARES Act, and \$300 million of which they received from Defendant Mark Zuckerberg’s Chan Zuckerberg Initiative. *Id.* at p. 10. Amber McReynolds’s “National Vote at Home Institute, then provided the state and local level officials, including the Defendants who are secretaries of state, all the “technical advice” they needed to apply the funds. *Id.* at 10–11. The Cabal enabled state and local officials to “bolster” mail-in voting in “37 states and D.C.” *Id.* at 11. Despite lawsuits “brought by the Trump campaign to sow doubt about mail voting,” the Cabal was able to achieve an incredible feat: “In the end, nearly half the electorate cast ballots by mail in 2020, practically a revolution of how people vote. About a quarter voted early in person. Only a quarter of voters cast their ballots the traditional way: in person on Election Day.” *Id.* at 12.

31. What is fascinating about the intense focus on Mail-In Voting by the Cabal/Defendants, composed of a “constellation of operatives across the left”, a “progressive movement” that apparently also contained many “bipartisan” actors from the Republican side,³³ is that, prior to 2020, Mail-In Voting had been almost

³³ *Id.* at 4, 7.

universally condemned in America as an inherently unsecure method of voting. See, e.g., Liptak, *Error and Fraud at Issue as Absentee Voting Rises*, NEW YORK TIMES (Oct. 6, 2012) (“[A]bsentee voting replaces the oversight that exists at polling places with something akin to an honor system.”); *Marks v Stinson*, CIV. A. 93-6157, 1994 WL 146113, at *1 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 26, 1994) (finding supposedly prevailing candidate “conducted an illegal absentee ballot conspiracy and that the [election officials] covertly facilitated the scheme”).

32. In fact, former President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State, Jim Baker, released a bi-partisan report in 2005 entitled “Building Confidence in U.S. Elections,” which made the following conclusions:

Fraud occurs in several ways. Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud. A notorious recent case of absentee ballot fraud was Miami’s mayoral election of 1998, and in that case, the judge declared the election fraudulent and called for a new election. Absentee balloting is vulnerable to abuse in several ways: Blank ballots mailed to the wrong address or to large residential buildings might get intercepted. Citizens who vote at home, at nursing homes, at the workplace, or in church are more susceptible to pressure, overt and subtle, or to intimidation. Vote buying schemes are far more difficult to detect when citizens vote by mail. States therefore should reduce the risks of fraud and abuse in absentee voting by prohibiting “third-party” organizations, candidates, and political party activists from handling absentee ballots. States also should make sure that absentee ballots received by election officials before Election Day are kept secure until they are opened and counted.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON FEDERAL ELECTION REFORM, BUILDING CONFIDENCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS (2005), p. 46 (the “Carter-Baker Report”). Not surprisingly, but eerily in keeping with the apparent vast reach of the Cabal to “control the flow of

information,”³⁴ the Carter-Baker Report has mysteriously disappeared from the website of American University’s Center for Democracy and Election Management, which facilitated the Commission and was the internet home of the Report until, very recently. This is evident by several internet searches for the document, leading to the link that is now defunct.³⁵ For the utterly disingenuous Cabal, it seems that *actual* measures to enhance election integrity are part of the “disinformation” to be “controlled.” Notably, even The New York Times reported on the inherent insecurity risks of Mail-In Voting in 2012, and over 60% of European countries and many other developed countries around the world ban the practice, except for citizens living overseas.³⁶

H. The Court cannot dismiss the Lawsuit on the grounds articulated in the Show Cause Order in the *Latinos for Trump* lawsuit.

33. On January 27, 2021, the Court entered a Show Cause Order (Doc. 10) (the “Show Cause Order”) in the lawsuit *Latinos for Trump et al., v. Sessions et al.* No. 6:21-cv-00043 (W. Dist. Tex. 2021) stating two grounds for dismissal of that lawsuit (“*Latinos for Trump*”).

34. Of particular importance to the People’s Lawsuit, is a paragraph from Secret History that neatly wraps up the elements of Defendants’ conduct into the elements necessary for a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claim against both federal and private individuals:

³⁴ *Id.* at p. 29.

³⁵ Plaintiffs have, nonetheless, obtained a copy of the Report available for viewing.

³⁶ Adam Liptak, *Error and Fraud at Issue as Absentee Voting Rises*, THE NEW YORK TIMES, (Oct. 6, 2012), available at <https://www.nytimes.com>; Paul Bedard, *Developed countries ‘ban’ mail-in voting, US would be ‘laughing stock’*:Report, WASHINGTON EXAMINER (Aug. 5, 2020) available at <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com>.

Their work [the Cabal, which includes Defendants] *touched every aspect of the election*. They got states [acting in concert with state officials] to change voting systems and laws [in violation of the Election Integrity Safeguards] and helped secure hundreds of millions in public [including funding from Congress] and private funding. They fended off voter-suppression lawsuits [many of which lawsuits were intended to prevent violations of the Election Integrity Safeguards], recruited armies of poll workers and got millions of people to vote by mail for the first time. They successfully pressured social media companies to take a harder line against disinformation and used data-driven strategies to fight viral smears [which constitutes interference with Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights to free speech]. They executed national public-awareness campaigns that helped Americans understand how the vote count would unfold over days or weeks, preventing Trump's conspiracy theories and false claims of victory from getting more traction [which was additional suppression of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights]. After Election Day, they monitored every pressure point to ensure that Trump could not overturn the result. "The untold story of the election is that thousands of people of both parties who accomplished the triumph of American democracy at its very foundation," says Norm Eisen, a prominent lawyer and former Obama Administration official who recruited Republicans and Democrats to the board of the Voter Protection Program [thus demonstrating the concert of action between both Democrats and Republicans to carry out the conspiracy].

Secret History, pp. 3–4. This paragraph clearly and precisely states Plaintiffs' claim against Defendants under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and other causes of action.

35. It is truly remarkable how conveniently Ms. Ball's Secret History laid out a roadmap for Plaintiffs' allegations in support of their various causes of action in this Lawsuit. Secret History also *prevents the media from attacking the Court* for any relief granted supporting Plaintiffs so-called "tin foil hat conspiracy theories," as the dishonest media would surely have attempted to do because Plaintiffs' allegations now come straight from one of the most well-respected and widely circulated

publications, TIME. It seems the Defendants/conspirators/Cabal were so pleased with themselves, that they could not help but announce their Secret History to the public, much like a terrorist organization would proudly claim responsibility for some heinous act.

36. In its Show Cause Order, the Court called for dismissal of the *Latinos for Trump* lawsuit on the grounds that § 1983 “does not apply to federal officers,” such as members of the 117th U.S. Congress, citing a non-binding, general proposition from the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. Contrary to the Court’s assertion, *binding* Supreme Court and Fifth Circuit precedent clearly hold that, for purposes of § 1983, acting “under color of law does *not* require that the accused be an officer of the state;” rather, “[i]t is enough that he is a willful participant in joint activity with the State or its agents.” *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787, 795 (1966); *Gomez v. Fla. State Employment Serv.*, 417 F.2d 569, 578 (5th Cir. 1969); *see also Kletschka v. Driver*, 411 F.2d 436, 448–49 (2d Cir. 1969) (“We can see no reason why a joint conspiracy between federal and state officials should not carry the same consequences under § 1983 as does joint action by state officials and private persons.”); *accord Tongol v. Usery*, 575 F. Supp. 409, 415 (N.D. Cal. 1983), *rev’d sub nom. on other grounds Tongol v. Donovan*, 762 F.2d 727 (9th Cir. 1985).

37. As will be even more fully alleged in the Statement of Facts below, Secret History sets forth, in great detail, how private individuals solicited federal money from the 116th Congress, who then distributed the federal money to state and local officials, who used the money, in joint activity with private persons, to violate

the Election Integrity Safeguards. The 117th Congress overwhelmingly includes members of the 116th Congress, and also includes private individuals who were willful participants in the conspiracy when they ran for office and were elected with the help of the conspirator Defendants, including state and local officials who acted to unlawfully change state election procedures in violation of the Election Integrity Safeguards. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine a scenario of a more willful joint conspiracy between federal and state officials who acted under the color of state law, namely the state elections laws, regulations, and procedures to deprive Plaintiffs of their constitutional civil rights.

38. Defendants' nefarious conspiracy to willfully deprive Plaintiffs of both their right to cast a lawful ballot in the 2020 Federal Elections and their right to not having their ballot diluted by fake or fraudulent ballots ("Ballot Box Stuffing")³⁷ is not only in violation of Plaintiffs' substantive due process voting rights and equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, but is a conspiracy to willfully deprive Plaintiffs and all Americans of the right to the republican form of government guaranteed in the Constitution.

39. Thus, the nature of Plaintiffs' causes of action under § 1983 are not, as the Court stated in the Show Cause Order, "a private right of action" or "declaratory relief" under HAVA, though this could likely have been unclear in the wording of the Original Complaint. Rather, Plaintiffs' claims are for "deprivation of . . . rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution." 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The severe

³⁷ The practice of diluting the votes of American citizens through the submission of ballots that are not submitted from a Citizen of the United States who is eligible to vote is hereinafter referred to as "Ballot Box Stuffing."

and pervasive violations of HAVA *and* the 1960 CRA³⁸ in all 53 Voting Districts is merely *evidence* that Plaintiffs constitutional rights have been violated to the fullest extent imaginable in addition to the other factual allegations contained herein. Accordingly, as will be more fully set forth the in Plaintiff's Response to the Show Cause Order, the HAVA cases cited in the Order are inapposite. The Election Integrity Safeguards clearly and obviously exist to protect Plaintiffs constitutional rights related to suffrage, but it is those constitutional rights themselves, not HAVA, under which Plaintiffs bring their § 1983 claims.

40. Moreover, Defendants' willful conspiracy included intentional and severe interference with Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights to freedom of speech, right to peaceable assembly, and right to petition the government for a redress of grievances, as will be described further below, providing further grounds for relief under § 1983. Plaintiffs also have causes of action against the federal officials, state officials, and private officials under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1985 and 1986, and directly against federal officials as a *Bivens* claim. Accordingly, the People's Lawsuit cannot be lawfully dismissed for all of the foregoing reasons. The Court has no right to further deprive the People of the United States of their constitutional rights related to suffrage and a representative form of government.

41. In sum, Defendants' vast conspiracy described in Secret History and further set forth in the Statement of facts, was a willful conspiracy to deprive Plaintiffs and all Americans of their fundamental constitutional rights, for which the

³⁸ Violations of the 1960 CRA were first asserted in the Memorandum to Support Entry of Alternative Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. 10).

Election Integrity Safeguards were specifically intended to protect. The egregious result of the conspiracy is that the 117th Congress, the President, and Vice President were elected and sworn into federal office in clear and willful violation of Plaintiffs', including the putative class members, and all 328 million Americans' constitutional rights, most importantly, the right to a republican form of government.

I. Conclusion to Introduction.

42. The violations committed through Defendants' conspiracy against Plaintiffs' constitutional rights described herein were so severe and pervasive that they resulted in federal elections by which none of the members of the House of Representatives and none of the members of the Senate who stood election in 2020 were lawfully elected pursuant to the Election Integrity Safeguards. The remaining Senators who did not stand election were willfull participants in the conspiracy and have violated their oaths of office. In the same manner, Defendants Biden and Harris were also not lawfully elected to office. The violations of HAVA and the 1960 CRA were so severe and pervasive that the 2020 federal elections cannot now be audited with any reasonable degree of certainty that Ballot Box Stuffing and other fraudulent activity did not unconstitutionally dilute Plaintiffs' votes and taint the "certified" results.

43. Accordingly, the only appropriate remedy is a new federal election conducted pursuant to the Election Integrity Safeguards. The Court must ensure a new federal election that should be the most transparent and closely-supervised in history.

44. Pending trial, the Court must enter temporary injunctive relief restraining the illegitimate Congress and Executive Branch from acting to pass new legislation and enforcing new executive orders departing from the status of U.S. law and policy as it existed as of January 3, 2021, except for such acts absolutely necessary for the administration and continuity of government. Mr. Biden and Ms. Harris must be included in such injunctive relief not only because the presidential election process was unlawful, but because Title 3, Chapter 1 of the United States Code, entitled “Presidential Elections and Vacancies” requires a congressional process to fill a vacancy of the offices of President and Vice President. This process includes confirming the count of Electoral Colleges votes and resolving objections to “any vote or paper from a State.” 3 U.S.C. § 15.

45. The 117th Congress had no authority to fill the vacancies of the offices of President and Vice President because this Congress was seated and given the oath of office in clear violation of the Constitution. After a new election, a lawful and legitimate Congress may well wish to hear and vote on objections to the 2020 Presidential elections that could possibly result in a change in whomever fills the vacancies of these offices through a constitutional process.

46. In conclusion, Plaintiffs merely demand that the Court enforce the constitutional rights for which the founding fathers of our nation gave their lives centuries ago. Plaintiffs request that the injunctive relief requested herein stay in place through trial by a jury of fellow Americans, to keep the rogue, illegitimate government from acting without the consent of the People, so that all Americans can,

once again, be assured that “*government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.*”

II. PARTIES

A. Plaintiffs

47. Jennilyn Salinas³⁹ is a resident of the state of Texas.

48. Lindsey Nguyen is a resident of the state of Washington.

49. Deanna Lorraine is a resident of the state of Texas.

50. “P.P.” is an individual who resides in the state of New York. P.P. files under initials due to a reasonable concern for personal safety and property and that of family in retaliation for filing this lawsuit.

51. “D.D.” is an individual who resides in the state of Texas. D.D. files under initials due to a reasonable concern for personal safety and property and that of family in retaliation for filing this lawsuit.

52. “T.M.” is an individual who resides in the state of Texas. T.M. files under initials due to a reasonable concern for personal safety and property and that of family in retaliation for filing this lawsuit.

53. “S.M.” is an individual who resides in the state of Texas. S.M. files under initials due to a reasonable concern for personal safety and property and that of family in retaliation for filing this lawsuit.

³⁹ Plaintiffs request that Jennilyn Salinas replace Jeremy Bravo as the first named Plaintiff in this case and that Jeremy Bravo be removed from the docket.

54. “M.L.” is an individual who resides in the state of Texas. M.L. files under initials due to a reasonable concern for personal safety and property and that of family in retaliation for filing this lawsuit.

B. Defendants

55. Defendant, Nancy Pelosi is a resident of the state of California who acted as an individual and in her official capacity as the Speaker of the US House of Representatives who may be served with process at 1236 Longworth H.O.B. Washington, DC 20515 or wherever she may be found.

56. Defendant, Mitch McConnell is a resident of the state of Kentucky who acted as an individual and in his official capacity as a US Senator and Senate Majority Leader who may be served with process at 317 Russell Senate Office Building Washington D.C or wherever he may be found.

57. Defendant, Chuck Schumer, is a resident of the state of New York and acted as an individual and in his official capacity as a US Senator who may be served with process at 322 Hart Senate Office Building Washington, D.C. 20510.

58. Defendant, Mark Zuckerberg is a resident of the state of California and acted as an individual and in his capacity as founder of the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative located at 314 Lytton Ave Palo Alto, Ca. 94301 and as founder and CEO of Facebook, located at 1 Hacker Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025, where he may be served with process or wherever else he may be found.

59. Defendant, Joseph Biden, is a resident of the state of Delaware and may be served with process at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, DC 20500.

60. Defendant, Kamala Harris, is a resident of the state of California and may be served with process at 3450 Massachusetts Ave. NW #1, Washington, DC 20392.

61. Defendant, Brad Raffensperger, is a resident of the state of Georgia who acted as an individual and in his official capacity as Georgia Secretary of State, who may be served with process at 214 State Capitol Atlanta, Georgia 30334.

62. Defendant Pete Sessions is the Congressman for the district in which the venue is located. Mr. Sessions had knowledge of and was a willful participant in the conspiracy described herein. In doing so, Mr. Sessions failed to protect the constitutional rights of his constituents. Mr. Sessions is a resident of the state of Texas and acted as an individual and in his official capacity. Mr. Sessions may be served with process at his Waco office at 400 Austin Avenue, Suite 302 Waco, TX 76701 or wherever he may be found.

63. Defendant Mike Podhorzer is, upon information and belief, a resident of the state of Maryland. Mr. Podhorzer is chairman of the board of Catalist and may be served with process at the Catalist office, 1310 L St NW #500, Washington, DC 20005 or wherever he may be found.

64. Defendant Jack Dorsey is a resident of the state of California. Mr. Dorsey is the CEO of Twitter and may be served with process at Twitter's corporate offices at 1355 Market St., Suite 900, San Francisco, CA 94103 or wherever he may be found.

65. Plaintiffs name, individually as Defendants all current, so-called members of the 117th Congress of the United States (the “Congressional Defendants”), including, as listed on **Exhibit 2**, all members of both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate who are individuals residing in the respective states they purport to represent and may be served with process on the floors of the House and Senate at the U.S. Capitol, First St, SE, Washington, DC 20004, or at their respective Washington D.C. offices ancillary to the U.S. Capitol. Plaintiffs will seek to serve these Defendants on the House and Senate floors by special appointment of the sergeants at arms.

66. Plaintiffs additionally names as Defendants, all the state governors and secretaries of state listed in **Exhibit 3** attached hereto (the “State Defendants”). These individuals reside in the respective state listed above their names and may be served with process at the addresses provide in **Exhibit 3** or wherever they may be found and/or as provided under their various states’ procedures for service of process.

67. Defendant Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee is a District of Colombia corporation that may be served with process through their registered agent, CT Corporation System, 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, TX 75201-3136.

68. Defendant Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee is a District of Colombia corporation that may be served with process through their registered agent, CT Corporation System, 1999 Bryan St., Ste. 900 Dallas, TX 75201-3136.

69. Defendant Republican National Committee is an unincorporated political association that may be served with process at their offices located at 310 First St., S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

70. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Furthermore, where, as here, deprivations of constitutional rights are alleged, including a conspiracy to deprive or failure to prevent or render aid regarding such deprivations, 28 U.S.C. § 1343 confers original subject matter jurisdiction on the federal district courts.

71. The Court has personal jurisdiction over the federal elected officials and private individuals named as Defendants because they acted as willful participants in conspiracy with state or local officials under color of law. In so doing, they violated the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs and putative class members, who live in Texas, as was foreseeable, and therefore, purposely availed themselves of or can reasonably anticipate being hailed into federal court in the State of Texas.

72. Venue is proper in this district because one or more of the Defendants resides in this district and the district has a substantial connection to the claim, since one or more of the Plaintiffs also reside in this district.

73. All conditions precedent to this action have occurred.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS

74. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein, including but not limited to, all of the factual allegations referenced in Secret History and all other allegations contained in the Introduction paragraphs 1–30.

A. Allegations Based on the Export Report by John S. Vanderbol.

75. All factual allegations contained in the expert report by John S. Vanderbol, entitled “Global Risk Analysis: Special Report” (the “Vanderbol Report”), attached hereto as **Exhibit 4**, are hereby incorporated by reference as though fully set forth herein. The following allegations are based on the Vanderbol Report, the research cited therein, and conducted in preparation thereof.

76. In the spring of 2019, concerned citizens seeking to protect their civil rights brought forth evidence and information to Defendants acting in partisan enterprises⁴⁰ regarding issues with election integrity and cybersecurity as well as enforcement requirements in the HAVA.⁴¹

77. On June 27th, 2019, the 116th House of Representatives sent to the Senate, H.R. 2722 also known as the SAFE ACT, an act designed to protect the civil rights of three hundred and twenty-eight million Americans.

78. Shortly after June 27, 2019, Congressional Defendants acting in a partisan enterprise in abuse of their elected offices in the 116th Senate moved the

⁴⁰ The Vanderbol Report elaborates on the meaning of the term “partisan enterprises,” a term of art.

⁴¹ Referencing the SAFE ACT and congressional record and other supporting documentation attached to the SAFE ACT.

SAFE ACT to the rules and administration committee with the intent to “kill” the act in committee in order to deprive three hundred and twenty-eight million Americans civil rights.

79. Defendants Schumer, McConnell, Durbin, Blunt, Cruz, among other Congressional Defendants, who were assigned to the Rules and Administration Committee, purposefully and under color of law took action to “kill” the SAFE ACT with the purpose to deny three hundred and twenty-eight million American people of their lawful civil rights, including their most important right: the guarantee of a republican form of government.⁴²

80. On July 17th 2019, the 116th House of Representatives forwarded to the Senate a “tax bill” that had no election protections or any component to protect the civil rights of American citizens. Shortly thereafter, Congressional Defendants, participating in partisan enterprises, would corrupt this “tax” bill at the request of conspiring State Defendants, as well as co-conspirators within the social media and business communities, in order to deny the American citizens of a lawful and constitutionally correct 2020 Federal Election.

81. In early 2020, the conspiring defendants at the state level, including high net worth individuals, engaged in the media and social media industries, as well as regional operation of partisan enterprises, approached Defendants at the federal level with a scheme to deny three hundred twenty-eight million Americans of their civil rights through fraudulent usage of the covid-19 pandemic as a reason to alter

⁴² Denial of the right to a republican form of government in this section also includes deprivation of the substantive due process rights and equal protection rights that related to suffrage.

procedures and conduct of the 2020 Federal election in willful violation of the Election Integrity Safeguards and state, local, and federal laws, policies, and procedures, such purpose being to deny American citizens of their right to vote and to deprive Americans their right to a republican form of government from that date and all election dates forward.

82. In early 2020, co-conspiring State Defendants and others at the state level, in concert with high net worth private individuals engaged in the media and social media industries as well as regional operation of partisan enterprises, approached Congressional Defendants at the federal level and sought from them 1.4 billion dollars in federal monies to execute their fraudulent schemes and deprive the three hundred and twenty-eight million Americans of their civil rights.

83. In response to these afore-mentioned conspiring Defendants' request for 1.4 billion dollars, the Congressional Defendants, acting willfully in concert with other individuals acting in partisan enterprises, unlawfully caused the issuance of 400 million dollars in federal monies, with knowledge the monies would be used to illegally deprive the American people of their constitutional rights.

84. In mid 2020, the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative, a foundation headed by Defendant Mark Zuckerberg, who had knowledge of the conspiring Defendants' fraudulent scheme, chose to become a willful participant in the conspiracy by causing Chan Zuckerberg to contribute 300 million dollars to the State Defendants and other officials at the state level for the purpose of depriving the American people of their civil rights.

85. Evidence provided by Plaintiffs, obtained from public sources, including media and official records, as submitted into the evidentiary record, show the conduct of willfully conspiring Defendants, who acted as members of staff of state election committees, staff of offices of secretaries of states, local partisan operatives, state partisan operatives in abuse of the offices and state-level partisan-engaged election officials; some of those persons received funds from Zuckerberg Chan while others received fraudulently obtained federal monies as disbursed by federal-level Congressional Defendants, who orchestrated, funded, directed, and managed, by third party, the partisan enterprise schemes, to willfully deprive American citizens of their constitutional rights by actively moving to unlawfully change state election rules, procedures, and policies in ways that violated the Help America Vote Act of 2002 and violated the records retention requirements of the 1960 CRA.

B. Violations of the 1960 Civil Rights Act.

86. As is typical of Defendants' above-described behavior, the former expert retained by Plaintiffs to give further support of the following allegations has apparently become the victim of an intimidation campaign and is no longer willing to testify. His expert report may be found in Civil Action No. 6:21-cv-43 as Document 14-4. Fortunately, Plaintiffs have already retained another expert witness for this matter.

87. All 53 Voting Districts destroyed "paper" and "records" that is required to be retained as various papers came into possession of election officials, pursuant to the 1960 CRA. The items destroyed were security envelopes which contained,

marked on the face of the envelope a security barcode unique to each ballot inside. Defendants issued unlawful procedures, policies and special waivers, which denied Plaintiffs of their constitutional rights intended to be protected through an available audit of the papers and records relating to the 2020 Federal Election.

88. In addition to the foregoing violations of the 1960 CRA, postage marks are required to be retained as a record to match the security bar code on the envelope to the address of the ballot to ensure a proper audit trail.

89. State Defendants and others acting at the state and local level under color of state law and as part of their conspiracy with the other Defendants, caused the execution and application of these unlawful policies and procedures that violated the 1960 CRA and therefore, violated the integrity of the election process by eliminating the ability to conduct any meaningful audit of the 2020 Federal Election papers, records, and other original materials, all of which are necessary for such an audit.

90. In so defeating the ability for an audit of these original materials, as prescribed by the 1960 CRA, these acts had the effect of depriving Plaintiffs of their right to a republican form of government and their other constitutional rights related to suffrage.

91. In all 53 Voting Districts, the state and local officials responsible for retaining original papers, records, and materials received and in their possession related to the 2020 Federal Election, implemented records retention policies in clear violation of section 301 of the 1960 CRA, and by thereby acted under color of state

and local law in a manner that willfully deprived Plaintiffs of their right to a republican form of government and their other constitutional rights related to suffrage.

92. The effect of Defendants' willful participation in the conspiracy, perpetrated in concert with private persons and public officials at the state and federal levels, as well as with Defendants named and to be named, who are engaged in the industries of media and social media, was to deprive three hundred and twenty-eight million Americans of their civil rights and the guaranteed constitutional republican form of government.

93. Since 2016, conspirators who willfully participated in the conspiracy at the state and federal levels, have acted in abuse of their official duties, changing policies and procedures to the sole benefit of the partisan enterprises with the willful intent and to deprive three hundred and twenty-eight million Americans of their civil rights and the guaranteed constitutional republican form of Government.

94. Many of the Defendants, including the Congressional Defendants, acted through the partisan enterprise known DNC Services Corporation, a private corporation, which filed false documents before federal and state courts falsely identifying the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee ("D-Triple-C") and the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee ("DSCC") as committees in charge of day-to-day operations of the Democratic Party. Both D-Triple-C and the DSCC have recently filed documents before the Texas state and federal courts both alleging the same fraudulent statement. Such conduct was done in furtherance of the conspiracy

so that individual Defendants named herein could commit their overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy through these corporate entities.

95. Many of the Defendants, including the Congressional Defendants, acted through the partisan association-in-fact enterprise known as the Republican National Committee to commit the acts identified herein in furtherance of the conspiracy to deprive Plaintiffs of their constitutional rights acting through an unincorporated political association.

96. The Defendants' conduct and statements show the use of corporate association-in-fact partisan enterprises in the manner of conduct of their acts in furtherance of the conspiracy to defraud the Plaintiffs of their constitutional rights.

97. For all reasons listed above and yet to be stated, Plaintiffs allege the result and purpose of Defendants' willful participation in the conspiracy, acting under color of state law and in egregious violation of constitutionally protected substantive due process and equal protection rights under the Fourteenth Amendment related to suffrage, was to deprive the People of the United States of the republican form of government guaranteed in the Constitution, Plaintiffs being among those People.

C. First Amendment Allegations

98. "In November 2019, Mark Zuckerberg invited nine civil rights leaders to dinner at his home," where they discussed and conspired about how to control the "flow of information" on social media to fit their purpose of the "ouster of [President] Trump" from office. In conspiracy with other social media CEOs, including Jack Dorsey, and various persons in the news media, this "Cabal" of news media, social

media, and technology “titans of business” conspired to “control the flow of information” by suppressing the political views of Plaintiffs and, in particular their support of particular candidates for Congress and for President Donald J. Trump. *See Secret History* (in particular, section under subheading “The Disinformation Defense”).

99. The overt acts in furtherance of this conspiracy were to censor the free speech of Plaintiffs by placing various “warnings” about “false” content in their posts, which Defendants had subjectively determined to be “disinformation” based on their invidious discriminatory animus against Plaintiffs for their political views and support of particular candidates.

100. Other overt acts taken or caused by Defendant Zuckerberg and his co-conspirator Defendant Jack Dorsey and their respective social media platforms, Facebook and Twitter, and other various social media platforms, included (1) “shadow banning” Plaintiffs’ posts, (2) placing Plaintiffs’ posts in an “echo chamber,” where the reach of their posts was limited as compared to other Americans on social media, who shared the political views of the Defendants, (3) suspending Plaintiffs’ accounts, and (4) involuntarily deleting Plaintiffs accounts altogether.

101. Whereas social media has quite literally become the modern-day “public square” where public debate and protected speech that underlies the very purpose of the First Amendment takes place. No other suppression of Plaintiffs’ right to free speech could be more severe than depriving them of the right to free speech on social media. By comparison, there is simply nowhere else for persons to go in this day and

age to voice their opinions on matters of political importance where their voices will be heard. As such, Defendants inflicted the harshest form of deprivation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights causing severe damages and mental anguish.

102. In addition, Defendant Zuckerberg participated in the same concert of action with the Cabal to cast Plaintiffs who exercised their First Amendment rights to peaceably protest at the U.S. Capitol on January 6, 2020 (the "Protest"). The method of this part of the conspiracy was to focus the attention of the media coverage and media posts on various bad actors who committed acts of violence at the Protest and attribute these bad acts to Plaintiffs who were merely peacefully exercising their protected First Amendment rights.

103. It was a classic "guilt by association" scheme designed to paint the Plaintiffs in a false light and stir public outrage against them for the purpose of interfering with their right of free speech and freedom to peaceably assemble.

D. Specific Failures to Comply with HAVA

104. HAVA is a statutory scheme enacted by the 107th Congress to "right those wrongs" of the 2002 Bush v. Gore and Congressional election debacle where "four to six million" Americans "never had their votes counted" due to "faulty machinery," "wrongful and illegal purges from voter lists," and "poorly designed ballots." 148 Cong. Rec. S10412-02 (Oct. 15, 2002) (statement of Sen. Dodd regarding final Senate conference report).

105. In his speech before Congress regarding the final Senate conference report, Senator Dodd specifically praised Defendants Mitch McConnell and Chuck

Schumer, for their “tremendous work” on HAVA, and went on to say HAVA was the “first civil rights legislation of the 21st century.” *Id.*

106. In doing so, Sen. Dodd acknowledged both the purpose of HAVA to protect our “most fundamental right as American citizens: the right to vote” in the United States, which he described as a “beacon light of self-government.” *Id.* Sen. Dodd’s comments also specifically shows the intent of Defendants Schumer and McConnell to deprive Americans of this “most fundamental right” including the right to “self-government” in their willful participation in the conspiracy to violate Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights.

107. Moreover, Sen. Dodd explained yet another reason why all the Congressional Defendants are liable for their willful participation in the conspiracy when he acknowledged that, with regard to election procedures, “each Member who serves here [in Congress] is an expert because they would not have arrived here had they not been elected.” *Id.* In other words, the Congressional Defendants knew full well what they were doing and cannot now feign ignorance of the Election Integrity Safeguards, particularly not Defendants McConnell and Schumer with regard to HAVA.

108. The current members of the 117th Congress who stood election in 2020 all took their oaths of office after willfully participating as candidates in an election they knew to be in violation of HAVA and the 1960 CRA and willfully benefitted from the federal and private money contributed by Congress and Zuckerberg that state officials used to violate HAVA and the 1960 CRA. Those who were members of the

116th Congress participated in approving federal funds to be distributed the state officials for use in violating HAVA and the 1960 CRA.

109. Defendant Joseph Biden was among the members of the U.S. Senate who voted in favor of HAVA and had knowledge of its purpose, provisions, and requirements. Yet, he took the oath of office for President of the United States on January 20, 2021 after willfully participating as a candidate in an election he knew to have been conducted in violation of HAVA and the 1960 CRA.

110. Defendant Kamala Harris was a Senator in the 116th Congress who voted for the CARES Act and approved federal funding which was used, with her knowledge, to violate HAVA and the 1960 CRA. Yet, she took the oath of office for Vice President of the United States on January 20, 2021 after willfully participating as a candidate in an election she knew to have been conducted in violation of HAVA and the 1960 CRA.

111. HAVA set forth specific “minimum requirements” with which the Defendants, as members of state or federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting under color of law, failed to comply in the conduct of the 2020 Federal Election.

112. The minimum requirements in HAVA stipulated specific duties regarding “mail in ballots,” “registration of voters by mail,” and highly detailed voter identification processes, and other requirements with which Defendants, as members of state or federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting under color of law failed to comply.

113. Defendants are members of state or federal government, or are governmental employees, or elected officials acting willfully alongside one another and/or in concert under color of law, who unlawfully used federal monies tied to HAVA to change state voting procedures in a manner which failed to meet lawful requirements defined as “minimum requirements” in HAVA and instead used federal monies for the purpose of causing all 53 federal Voting Districts to fail to comply with federal election law.

114. Defendants as members of state or federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting willfully alongside one another and/or in concert under color of law, engaged in acts of selective enforcement to fraudulently certify federal elections as valid, when in fact they were unlawful and failed to meet criteria set forth in federal law and state law.

115. Defendants as members of state or federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting willfully alongside one another and/or in concert under color of law, had specific knowledge of administrative requirements due to HAVA, and willfully failed to implement these requirements.

116. Defendants as members of state and federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting alongside one another and/or in concert under color of law, by oath have specific duties which they failed to perform, instead willfully supported acts of conspiracy to unlawfully influence a federal election.

117. Defendants as members of state and federal government, or governmental employees, or elected officials acting alongside one another and/or in concert under color of law, after Plaintiffs and other third parties raised concern regarding the possibility of an unlawful election, engaged in acts to destroy evidence, inhibit discovery, and engaged in fraudulent statements to defend a conspiracy to engage in the conduct described herein.

118. The Congressional Defendants willfully passed the CARES Act to provide federal money used to modify state procedures for federal elections in violation of HAVA and then failed to amend HAVA to accommodate these changes to state procedures for federal elections.

119. The foregoing actions of Defendants, willfully participating in joint activity in the conspiracy described herein, resulted in the failure of every election conducted in the 53 Voting District to comply with the Election Integrity Safeguards.

120. A list of many (but not all) of each State's specific violations of HAVA is attached hereto as **Exhibit 5**.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

A. COUNT ONE – Conspiracy and conduct to deprive of constitutional rights related to suffrage and the right to a republican form of government under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

121. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

122. Defendants, which include the federal officials, state officials, and⁴³ private persons named herein, acted under color of state law—the various states’ elections, laws, regulations, procedures, and administration thereof—related to the 2020 Federal Election, as willful participants in a conspiracy consisting of joint activity with state and local officials, including the state Governors and Secretaries of State named herein, and acted with each state and voting district, to deprive Plaintiffs of their various rights, privileges, and/or immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States.

123. These various Constitutional rights include, (1) all substantive due process rights related to suffrage and casting a vote in a federal election, (2) all equal protection rights related to the right of suffrage being debased or dilution of the weight of Plaintiffs’ votes, and (3) deprivation of Plaintiffs’ rights to the republican form of government guaranteed by Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution.

124. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were acting as private citizens related to their rights of suffrage and rights to a republican form of government.

125. Defendants’ conspiracy and conduct against Plaintiffs would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in these protected constitutional rights.

⁴³ The terms “and” and the term “or” are intended throughout this Complaint to be construed in their broadest use possible as “and/or” or similar, except where such interpretation would not make logical or grammatical sense or such interpretation would operate to prevent Plaintiffs from stating a claim upon which relief could be granted.

126. Plaintiffs' protected constitutional rights were a substantial and motivating factor for Defendants' conspiracy and conduct to deprive them of these rights.

127. Defendants' decision to violate Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights was not objectively reasonable in light of the circumstances.

128. Defendants' conspiracy described herein caused severe damages to Plaintiffs in depriving them of their Constitutional rights and subjecting them to suffer the dominion and control of an illegitimate Congress, President, and Vice President, which enacted Executive Orders, policies, and/or legislation in violation of Plaintiffs' rights to a government whose legitimate acts must be by consent of the governed, a republican form of government.

129. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused Plaintiffs to suffer other severe damages, including mental anguish and emotional suffering.

B. COUNT TWO – Conspiracy and conduct to deprive of First Amendment rights and retaliate for the free exercise thereof under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

130. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

131. Defendants acts described herein, including but not limited to, interfering with and/or retaliating against Plaintiffs for the free exercise of their First Amendment rights to free speech by “controlling the flow of information” related to Plaintiffs' rights to speak about suspected fraud in the 2020 Federal Election and/or to voice support for a particular political candidate and/or to express a political view

on social media; rights to petition the government for redress of grievances by the relief sought herein and through verbal acts in protest of the illegitimate Congress counting the Electoral College votes on January 6, 2021 whether at the Capitol in person or on social media, and their rights to peaceably assemble in protest.

132. Defendants conspiracy and conduct in violation of Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights also specifically includes the acts of Roger Sollenberger in concert with his various colleagues at Salon.com, including but not limited to Justin Pelofsky, in retaliation against Plaintiffs for exercising their rights to petition the government for redress of their grievances in this Lawsuit. Such conspiracy and conduct included spreading objectively and patently false statements publicly about the Lawsuit and conducting an intimidation campaign against Plaintiffs' counsel in this matter for attempting to enforce Plaintiffs' constitutional rights before this Court.

133. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were acting as private citizens related to matters of public concern.

134. Defendants' acts against Plaintiffs would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in their protected First Amendment rights.

135. Plaintiffs' protected First Amendment rights were a substantial and motivating factor for Defendants' conduct to deprive them of their rights.

136. Defendants' decision to violate Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights was not objectively reasonable in light of the circumstances.

137. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused Plaintiffs to suffer severe damages, including mental anguish and emotional suffering.

C. COUNT THREE Conspiracy to interfere with constitutional rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1985.

138. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

139. By the conduct described in the foregoing paragraphs, Defendants conspired together, whether directly or indirectly, for the purpose of depriving Plaintiffs of their constitutional rights related to their substantive due process rights to suffrage and related equal protection rights, their rights to a republican form of government, and their various rights under the First Amendment.

140. Defendants' conspiracy was also for the purpose of depriving Plaintiffs of their rights to give "support or advocacy in a legal manner toward or in favor of the election of one or more lawfully qualified persons a an elector for President or Vice President, or as a Member of Congress of the United States." § 1985(3).

141. Defendants' conspiracy was also for the purpose of retaliating against Plaintiffs from exercising all of the above constitutional rights.

142. Defendants' conspiracy was motivated by class-based invidious discriminatory animus based on Plaintiffs race, color, political group, political view, or support of one or more particular candidates for office.

143. Defendants' conspiracy included illegal actions that were the product of the discriminatory animus.

144. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused Plaintiffs to suffer severe damages, including mental anguish and emotional suffering.

D. COUNT FOUR – Action for neglect to prevent under 42 U.S.C. § 1986.

145. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

146. Defendants had knowledge of the conspiracy and conduct to be done, as set forth above, had the power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of the same, and neglected or refused so to do, resulting in the deprivation of Plaintiffs’ various constitutional rights set forth herein.

147. Plaintiffs suffered severe damages by Defendants’ failure to prevent or aid in preventing the deprivation of their constitutional rights, including⁴⁴ mental anguish and emotional suffering.

E. COUNT FIVE – *Bivens* claim for conspiracy and/or conduct to deprive of constitutional rights related to suffrage and the right to a republican form of government

148. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

149. Defendants, which include the federal officials and private persons named herein, acted under color of state law—the various states’ elections, laws, regulations, procedures, and administration thereof—related to the 2020 Federal Election, as willful participants in a conspiracy consisting of joint activity with state and local officials, including the state Governors and Secretaries of State named herein, and acted with each state and voting district, to deprive Plaintiffs of their

⁴⁴ The term “including” shall always be read in this Complaint to mean “Including but not limited to” unless such meaning does not make logical or grammatical sense in context or would result in a failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted.

various rights, privileges, and/or immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States.

150. These various Constitutional rights include, (1) all substantive due process rights related to suffrage and casting a vote in a federal election, (2) all equal protection rights related to the right of suffrage being debased or dilution of the weight of Plaintiffs' votes, and (3) deprivation of Plaintiffs' rights to the republican form of government guaranteed by Article IV, section 4 of the Constitution.

151. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were acting as private citizens related to their rights of suffrage and rights to a republican form of government.

152. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct against Plaintiffs would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in these protected constitutional rights.

153. Plaintiffs' protected constitutional rights were a substantial and motivating factor for Defendants' conspiracy and conduct to deprive them of their rights.

154. Defendants' decision to violate Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights was not objectively reasonable in light of the circumstances.

155. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct violated Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights according to the standards set forth in relevant case law relating to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971)

156. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused severe damages to Plaintiffs by depriving them of their Constitutional rights and subjecting them to suffer the dominion and control of an illegitimate Congress, President, and Vice President, which enacted Executive Orders, policies, and/or legislation in violation of Plaintiffs' rights to a government whose legitimate acts must be by consent of the governed, a republican form of government.

157. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused Plaintiffs to suffer severe damages, including mental anguish and emotional suffering.

F. COUNT SIX – *Bivens* claim for conspiracy and/or conduct to deprive of First Amendment rights.

158. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate all allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

159. Defendants acts described herein, including but not limited to, interfering with and/or retaliating against Plaintiffs for the free exercise of their First Amendment rights to free speech by "controlling the flow of information" related to Plaintiffs' rights to speak about suspected fraud in the 2020 Federal Election and/or to voice support for a particular political candidate and/or to express a political view on social media; rights to petition the government for redress of grievances by the relief sought herein and through verbal acts in protest of the illegitimate Congress counting the Electoral College votes on January 6, 2021, whether at the Capitol in person or on social media, and their rights to peaceably assemble in protest.

160. At all relevant times, Plaintiffs were acting as private citizens related to matters of public concern.

161. Defendants acts against Plaintiffs would deter a person of ordinary firmness from continuing to engage in their protected First Amendment rights.

162. Plaintiffs' protected First Amendment rights were a substantial and motivating factor for Defendants' conduct to deprive them of their rights.

163. Defendants' decision to violate Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights was not objectively reasonable in light of the circumstances.

164. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct violated Plaintiffs' clearly established constitutional rights according to the standards set forth in relevant case law relating to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971)

165. Defendants' conspiracy and conduct described herein caused Plaintiffs to suffer severe damages, including mental anguish and emotional suffering.

VI. CLASS ACTION

166. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

167. Plaintiffs will soon file a motion for class action certification pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26 making the following allegations.

168. There are one or more definable classes of persons injured by the conduct of Defendants. One such class would include all persons who voted in the 2020 Federal Elections. Another such class or classes may include all persons against whom Defendants conspired to deprive of various First Amendment rights or against whom they acted in retaliation for the exercise thereof. Truly, however, ALL

Americans are affected by the deprivation of a republican form of government. So the most obvious class is, quite simply, all American citizens.

169. The classes to be certified are so numerous that joinder of all members is impracticable. Indeed there are roughly 328 million Americans, and over 150 million Americans voted in the 2020 Federal Elections. The number of potential class members whose First Amendment rights were violated by Defendants' conspiracy and conduct is likely so numerous that it cannot reasonably be estimated. There are at least 75 million Americans who supported Donald Trump and were likely victims of Defendants conduct, as described herein and in Secret History, in addition to tens of millions of Bernie Sanders supporters who were similarly victimized.

170. The questions of law and fact are common to each putative class since the class members have suffered the same injuries by the same or similar conduct of the Defendants.

171. The putative classes have claims that are typical of all class members.

172. Plaintiffs, as members of the various proposed classes, are representatives with interests that are common to the classes and will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the putative classes. There is no conflict of interest between Plaintiffs and the members of the putative classes.

173. Plaintiffs have competent counsel. Plaintiffs' undersigned lead counsel has over 10 years of relevant and extensive experience in the issues concerning this Lawsuit. Such experience includes litigating multiple federal court class and collective actions in the areas of employment law, complex commercial, and complex

chapter 11 bankruptcy litigation as an associate and later senior attorney for two large national law firms over an 8-year span. Lead counsel gained additional valuable first-chair courtroom and litigation experience as an associate in a boutique commercial litigation for roughly 18 months before returning to large-firm practice.

174. The practice of employment law is, in large part, the practice of civil rights and constitutional rights. Counsel's experience has included mostly outside counsel work but also includes, as is certainly well-known by now, in-house counsel and human resource management for a workforce of over 1,000 employees.

175. Counsel's experience in researching and analyzing issues of constitutional law dates back to law school at The University of Texas at Austin, where he was associate and later senior editor for the Texas Review of the Law and Politics, which regularly publishes scholarly articles on such issues. Counsel also has been mentored extensively by various litigators and appellate lawyers in these fields with many years of experience. Said counsel has been lead counsel or has effectively acted as lead counsel on multiple complex federal court lawsuits including class/collective actions.

176. An organization is being set up to recruit attorneys to assist undersigned Counsel in recruiting other attorneys to assist when the court grants class action certification. Counsel is confident that this organization will be able to recruit more than enough other attorneys to assist him and his staff with this lawsuit going forward to represent the classes to be certified.

**VII.
APPLICATION FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, INCLUDING A TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER, PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, AND PERMANENT
INJUNCTION**

177. Plaintiffs hereby incorporate the allegations in the foregoing paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

A. Requesting the Court merely do its duty to enforce the Constitution should not be controversial, especially when compared to the immediate and irreparable harm that will be suffered by Plaintiffs.

178. Plaintiffs' plea before this Honorable Court is to now join with them, in this current constitutional crisis of an unlawfully elected Congress and President, when all other safeguards set forth in the Constitution of the United States for checks and balances on unlimited, tyrannical government power have been breached, to muster merely a fraction of the courage displayed by the founding fathers of our Republic, who so willingly and boldly sacrificed their blood, their tears, their fortunes, whether meager or vast, and even their very lives, to win their freedom from a tyrannical monarchy across the ocean.

179. Plaintiffs would point out that granting the injunctive relief requested herein is actually very reasonable and should not be controversial. At a time when at least 60% of Americans are sick and tired of the corrupt two-party system because the "parties do such a poor job representing the American people,"⁴⁵ the Court would not actually be "going against the grain," but would merely be officially recognizing what most Americans already know to be true: the two-party system is corrupt and

⁴⁵ Jeffrey M. Jones, *Support for Third U.S. Political Party at High Point*, Gallup (February 15, 2020); Gabrielle Schulte, *Poll: 60 percent of voters say a viable third party is need to have an effective political system*, The Hill (Sept. 18, 2020).

is not working for the American people. In 2020, its corrupt nature actually resulted in the deprivation of the Plaintiffs' constitutional rights described herein.

180. Where our founding fathers laid down their lives for the freedom to have a representative, republican form of government, by comparison, it does not seem like much to ask of the Court to merely enforce these rights that were earned by the shedding of blood in a brutal war with the British and later enshrined in the document we know to be the Constitution of the United States.

B. Plaintiffs are entitled to injunctive relief against Defendants on the following grounds:

181. **Plaintiffs will certainly suffer immediate and irreparable harm** if the Court does not immediately enter the injunctive relief requested herein.⁴⁶ If the Defendants, and the illegitimate Congress and President their actions installed, are able to continue govern the Republic, it will cease to be a republic. It may become a true RINO “*republic* in name only” in the sense that the “People’s Republic of China” contains the word “Republic,” although it is common public knowledge that the China does not in any way belong to its people.

182. It belongs to a tyrannical, authoritarian, communist police state that engages in atrocities against humanity, including the active persecution of proponents of free speech, democracy, persons of faith, and anyone else who poses a view that does not demonstrate absolute and unquestioning loyalty to the state and whatever ideologies it chooses to cram down the throats of its citizens. The risk of

⁴⁶ Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1); *Fairchild Semiconductor Corp. v. Third Dimension (3D) Semiconductor, Inc.*, 564 F. Supp. 2d 63, 66–68 (D. Me. 2008); *Nw. Airlines, Inc. v. Bauer*, 467 F. Supp. 2d 957, 963–64 (D.N.D. 2006); see *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008).

the United State government descending into such an oppressive police state is tangible and imminent if the government ceases to be accountable to the People, as occurred in the illegal 2020 Federal Election.

183. Indeed, the FBI has already targeted, intimidated, and even arrested many American citizens who were peacefully exercising their First Amendment right to protest violations of election integrity at the US Capitol and were not acting in any violent manner like certain others. So, the persecution of political dissidents under the unconstitutional regime of Mr. Biden has already begun and will only get worse if the Court refuses to act.

184. Furthermore, as set forth in **Exhibit 4**, if the Court does not grant a restraining order against the illegitimate Congress and Executive Branch and order a new, lawful federal election, the economy of the United States will and become unstable and will cease to be a “safe haven” for financial investors. If investors come to view their investments in assets held in the United States as inherently unstable due to the Constitutional Crisis, it is clear that would have a devastating effect on the Plaintiffs’ ability to plan for retirement by investing in 401(k)s, IRAs, or other such accounts.

185. Indeed, confidence in the U.S. Dollar has likely never been lower and petroleum prices are beginning to sharply spike. Not only does this result in the severe depletion of the savings of working-class Americans, but it exposes all Americans to acts of terrorism and the risk of losing loved-ones proudly serving in the military to death and injury in foreign military conflicts.

186. As set forth in a report attached to a forthcoming motion for temporary restraining order, the price of oil directly affects the capabilities of the enemies of the United States to carry out terrorism and military campaigns in the middle east. President Trump's energy policy made the United States energy-independent. The resulting fall in oil prices crippled the government of Russia, which, at the time President Trump took office, had a break even budget tied to oil being \$100 per barrel. During President Trump's tenure, low oil prices defunded Russia's military such that they could not exert influence in the middle east, as they had for decades.

187. The Court should note that President Trump was the first President to keep the United States from getting involved in a new military conflict in over 40 years, thus saving the lives of countless members of America's armed services. ISIS, all but disappeared from existence during this same time. This was not some sort of "magic wand" waved by President Trump, but rather the result of a sound energy policy that had the effect of defunding America's adversaries abroad. The historic peace deal between Israel and the UAE came after an unprecedented time of relative world peace.

188. Now, the slew of executive orders from Mr. Biden, including policies such as ending the XL Pipeline, which not only put oilfield workers in the unemployment lines, but is clearly having an effect as oil prices continue to rise. No doubt, Russia and ISIS are licking their chops. If the Court fails to act to enforce the Constitution, it will only get worse. An amnesty bill is now imminent which will all but erase our borders, and legislation and executive orders are already in the works

to deprive Americans of their Second Amendment right to defend themselves as times get more desperate. ***How long until Americans can take no more and resort to unprecedented forms of self-help in the wake of our federal courts' abdication of their role to uphold the rule of law?***

189. **Thus, there is no adequate remedy at law⁴⁷** because it would be impossible to calculate an appropriate amount of monetary damages that would compensate Plaintiffs for such harm. Indeed, no one could even guarantee that Defendants would have sufficient financial assets available for legal damages if the U.S. financial market experience prolonged instability or even total collapse, especially given that the U.S. Government is close to \$30 trillion in debt. It is also obvious that the risk of permanent deprivation of the right to vote in federal elections, which could be lost forever if the Defendants are not restrained from further action and the Acts of Congress, taken after January 3, 2021 are not restrained from having legal effect.

190. Congress has already acted to propose the “For the People Act,” which guts HAVA and the 1960 CRA and provides for *nationwide mail-in voting!* While the Courts are busy holding that state officials have such “sovereign” power over elections that they can change the rules in the middle of the game (as in many of the presidential election cases), Congress is busy making it so that the states will forever lose the power to protect their citizens’ rights to free and fair elections by denying states the right to limit inherently unsecure mail-in voting in federal elections and

⁴⁷ *Prudential Ins. Co. of Am. v. Inlay*, 728 F. Supp. 2d 1022, 1030–31 (N.D. Iowa 2010); see *Ruggieri v. M.I.W. Corp.*, 826 F. Supp. 2d 334, 336 (D. Mass. 2011).

other unsecure processes such as ballot-harvesting, internet voter registration, and same day voter registration.

191. **There is a substantial likelihood that Plaintiffs will prevail on the merits of their claims.**⁴⁸ Plaintiffs' probable right to relief is clearly demonstrated in the foregoing allegations.

192. **The threatened harm to Plaintiffs outweighs the harm that the injunctive relief would inflict on Defendants.**⁴⁹ It is self-evident that the loss of the right to government by consent of the governed is far worse than any harm Defendants may suffer if the Court grants the injunctive relief requested herein. Defendants will suffer no harm merely by temporarily losing their power to dramatically change the laws and policy of the United State. Indeed, the only harm that would be suffered by Defendants is harm to their pride that their illegitimate power will be temporarily limited until a jury of Americans can hear the evidence.

193. **Issuance of the injunctive relief would not adversely affect the public interest and public policy.**⁵⁰ It is self-evident that preventing the loss of the right to government by consent of the governed is in the public interest.

194. **The Court should enter this injunctive relief, including a temporary restraining order with or without notice to Defendants,** because Plaintiffs will likely suffer further immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage

⁴⁸ *Prudential Ins. Co.*, 728 F. Supp. 2d at 1029; *Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.*, 564 F. Supp. 2d at 66–67.

⁴⁹ *Prudential Ins. Co.*, 728 F. Supp. 2d at 1031–32; *Fairchild Semiconductor Corp.*, 564 F. Supp. 2d at 66; see *Schiavo ex rel. Schindler v. Schiavo*, 403 F.3d 1223, 1225–26 (11th Cir. 2005).

⁵⁰ *Prudential Ins. Co.*, 728 F. Supp. 2d at 1032; *Midwest Retailer Associated, Ltd. v. City of Toledo*, 563 F. Supp. 2d 796, 812 (N.D. Ohio 2008).

if the order is not granted before Defendants can be heard. Plaintiffs will file a motion requesting special appointment for service of process, however, the vast list of Defendants in disparate geographical locations makes service of process on all Defendants impracticable compared to the urgent need for immediate relief.

195. Moreover, given that the allegations and evidence revealed in this Complaint could result in federal criminal prosecutions for various high crimes and misdemeanors, including but not limited to sedition, treason, racketeering, malfeasance by public officials, wire fraud, mail fraud, etc., there is a high risk that Defendants will destroy evidence prior to being given notice of injunctive relief once they are forced to take this lawsuit seriously.

196. Plaintiffs will request issuance of summons and practicable methods of service for the Defendants. However, service of each Defendant is likely not practicable prior to the time within which a Temporary Restraining Order should be granted, which is immediately. The federal officials named in and subject to the relief requested in this lawsuit continue to take sweeping action to drastically change the policies and laws of this country in violation of Plaintiffs' and the putative class members' constitutional rights.

197. Accordingly Plaintiffs request a temporary restraining order consistent with the relief described herein⁵¹ with notice or, alternatively, without notice to Defendants in a form of order to be attached to a separately filed motion for temporary restraining order. After 14 to 28 days, Plaintiffs request entry of a preliminary

⁵¹ Specific reference is made to in subsection "I,I" Conclusion to the Introduction

injunction, upon a hearing thereof that should last until trial, at which time Plaintiffs request entry of a permanent injunction consistent with the relief requested herein.

**VIII.
ATTORNEYS' FEES & COSTS**

198. Plaintiff are entitled to an award of attorney fees and costs under 42 U.S.C. § 1988(b) and hereby plead for the same.

**IX.
PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, upon jury trial of this matter, plead for judgment against Defendants for the following:

- a. Permanent injunctive relief in the form of a new federal election for Congress, President, and Vice President;
- b. Permanent injunctive relief forever restraining Defendants from ever holding public office or participating in any way in an election campaign to public office other than exercising their own right to vote;
- c. Permanent injunctive relief forever restraining Defendants from violating Plaintiffs' constitutional rights described herein,
- d. General Damages in an amount to be determined at the time of trial;
- e. Punitive Damages in an amount to be determined at the time of trial;
- f. Reasonable attorneys fees' and costs of suit;
- g. Prejudgment and postjudgment interest;

And all other general and special relief, whether at law or in equity as the Court may deem necessary or proper to which the Plaintiffs may be justly entitled.

Respectfully submitted to the Honorable Court this 24th day of March, 2021

/s/ Paul M. Davis

Paul M. Davis

Texas Bar Number 24078401

paul@fireduptxlawyer.com

PAUL M. DAVIS & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

3245 Main St., Suite 235, #377

Frisco, TX 75034

Phone: 469-850-2930

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFFS